

Food Stamp Error Reduction

April 22, 2002
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Christina Martin, Jacaie Countant, Jackie Bennett, Marcia Williamson, Chris Elms, Kathy Judd, Jenny Thompson, Sara Pynenberg, Edie Sprehn, Lisa Hanson, Maxine Ellis, Staci Wanty, Mike McKenzie, Tom Prete

Phone: Joanne Ator, Lorie Mueller, Pat Woldt

I. Review Minutes from Last Meeting

No minutes were completed for the last meeting. Nothing was approved – literally.

Action Steps: none

II. Second Party Reviews – Lisa

Lisa gave a brief updated on the 2nd party review automated reporting system. Currently, changes can't be made by agencies once entered. Lisa is able to do that. Discussing ways agencies can pull their own reports.

III. Latest Error Rate Data – Mike

Mike was late, so we left him in the dust (much like his Vikings in the new NFC North division) and went on with other agenda items. After the delay of game penalty, Mike make his first pass attempt for a completion – the FS Error Rate Summary handout. Then did a handoff with an error chart for Oct, Nov, and Dec. There was an 11 yard (point) loss from Nov to Dec (from 22.1 down to 9.1).

Mike's fourth down conversion attempted failed. Lisa took possession on the turn over and provided January data. She scores! January 2002 was 9.9, pulling down FYY 2002 through January to 12.2, but some reviews are still missing.

The error summary report had more data elements, including the reason for the error. Jackie wanted even more detail – identifying if it is a CARES error, APE, client error, etc.

Jacaie said it would be nice to have a report available to list the high issuance cases. Even though the Data Warehouse report would be prior month data, it would still provide relevant data. Sara said there are quite a few reports that are going to be available.

Jenny talked about training for Data Warehouse. The Training Unit currently has a proposal to have Level 1 training be self-taught with study guide. People would send in requests, get the packet and access and train themselves. Second Level users would go to training (creating your own reports, etc.). This is not yet implemented, waiting for approval.

Tom suggested that a section be added to the packet explaining WHY reports were created, what red-flags they may bring up, what questions they may raise to help guide agencies in the use of the reports in a practical and relevant way.

Action Steps

Mike will talk to Dave Hippler about adding a "High Issuance by Agency" report. Mike will also ask Dave to attend our next meeting to give an update on Data Warehouse – when it will be available, training, access, available reports, and take feedback on additional reports.

IV. Local Agency Error Reduction Grant Proposals - Lisa

Lisa handed out the listing of the final approved proposals. The agencies with approved proposals are: Columbia, Dane, Kenosha, LaCrosse, Lincoln, Marathon, Milwaukee, Oconto, Richland, Rock, Sheboygan, St. Croix County, Waupaca, and Winnebago. Funding has not yet been distributed. Some of the proposals that were scored high couldn't be approved because of federal standards, others were approved, but with limited funding. The proposal awards have not been publicly announced. No time frame yet for announcement. There is an expectation of measurement/evaluation for each proposal. Lisa has a draft letter. Evaluation process must be approved by ONSPI.

Action Steps – Lisa is working on the process for funding distribution and announcement to agencies.

V. Conference Review – Lisa

Lisa handed out the overall evaluation report from the conference. Individual session results were not yet available.

The conference next year will be combined with the Big Ten conference in Milwaukee at the Hilton and will be in August 2003.

Action Steps – none.

VI. Workload Study - Mike

Jackie reported back from IMAC –WCHSA group suggested more re-investment money go directly to counties and into CARES fixes. Jackie will provide the workgroup findings/suggestions that came out of this group. Sara said quite a few are already being addressed – especially the automation of categorically eligible situations.

Sara said they are working on having the client error for under-issuance waived by having new statement attached to end of CAF saying if they fail to report information that would result in an increase in benefits, they will not be entitled to that increase. Waiting for approval from the feds. D & T already has statement prepared and translated into Spanish, waiting for approval.

Sara also asked feedback from group if they ended up having just a FS paper application – would it be easier? Brief discussion ensued. No formal adopted stance taken on this issue.

Mike reported on the subgroup. He said there was a concern on letting agencies know resulting action on suggestions provided to the group and the State. Mike said the group did not come up with a consensus on how to do that. They compiled the full list of suggestions on the workload study. There is a follow-up meeting on May 6th. Mike will update our group as things go on. Mike wants feedback on how to distribute “good news” to agencies on things that are being done.

Sara suggested sending out a newsletter (previous suggestion from prior meetings) that has that info in it and also lists all the agencies that have zero error rate. Mike suggested doing one quarterly. The newsletter could be posted on the Workweb. No final decision on the newsletter or who would be responsible for writing it or issuing it.

Mike said the other big thing that came out of this meeting was how important of an issue alerts are for workers. Mike knows that is still a “BIG, big” issue, but suggested we may need to take this issue up again and maybe break it down into a more narrow focus. Jacaie said she has been doing a lot of training on alerts and said even if we took the baby step of helping workers understand what programs the alerts apply to, it would reduce errors. Jackie said it would be helpful just to identify the program on the alert.

Group came to consensus to revisit the Alert issue. Mike said it would take at least two hours to go through the initial discussion. It will be on the May agenda. Tom asked whatever happened to WPFN for ES. It was a priority, but had been shifted. Mike said that it was just brought up again and they were initially thinking data warehouse would take care of that. But group members brought up that WPFN is updated twice a week and is accessible by all workers. Data Warehouse is prior month data, updated only once a month and not easily accessible (is outside of CARES). Mike said, they may have to look at an ES version of WPFN then. There are also other CARES priorities to look at to.

Action Steps

Mike will invite Dave to come to our next meeting regarding Data Warehouse reports and the group will take up Alerts at the next meeting. Group members should review the Alert packet on New Worker central and Jackie will email the Alert issue paper.

VII. FFY 2002 Sanctions – Mike

The final error for FFY 2001 should be reported to the state sometime in May. The error rate did go up slightly this last FFY – but the national average did too. Mike’s educated guess is that there will be between one million and one and a half million dollars to reinvest.

Action Steps

None

VIII. FFY 2002 Reinvestment

Mike said they are looking at maybe taking the entire reinvestment amount and investing into an automated document scanning process. Other ideas will be looked at too and Mike said suggestions are welcome. Marcia brought up a suggestion for a statewide reporting center.

Action Steps

None

IX. Client Education

- **Power Point Study - Tom**

Looked at a skeleton of the PowerPoint show. There are five categories in the main menu. Discussed the level of detail that should be in show. Group decided to have full info on reporting policies because it would be easy to update. Tom apologized for not getting it completed – stated had a lot of other projects going on. Target date for completed draft will be May 3rd. Tom will email to all committee members for review. Agency representatives will share with staff. Talked about piloting, but decided that review can be done by members and their agencies. A challenge will be to make sure it is detailed enough to be worthwhile, but not so detailed that it will take too much time.

Format – have each category timed, so it can automatically go through without any clicking of the mouse, but allow the mouse click to be used if wants to speed up show.

Action Steps:

*Sara will fax Tom simplified R & R form.

*Mike will have Judy Waffle provide EBT info to Tom. Kathy Judd will also provide support for EBT information.

*Tom will email draft show to members by 5/3. Members will review and share with their agencies (if applicable) and provide feedback to Tom via email and phone PRIOR to next meeting. Will review “final” version at May meeting.

- **Initial Page - Marcia**

Marcia said didn't have a lot to talk about, but want it kept on agenda because it is an ongoing project. She clarified that is not the “initial” page, but page four. Marcia said there are a number of groups working on overlapping issues related to this project.

Action Steps:

Keep on agenda. Marcia will forward recommendations to Applications Update group.

- **Follow-Up Letter - Lisa**

There is a PCR for the letter that will be implemented in two phases. In phase one, the letter will be put in CARES and workers will have to manually send it out. In the second phase, it will become automated. Lisa said there should not be a long gap between the two phases. Sara/Mike said it is a high priority to have it automated. Marcia expressed concern that it not take a long time to implement phase two. Mike took that as an expression of interest to be on the workgroup, so he “volunteered” her to participate. She said she would have to take it up with her boss 😊.

Group agreed that letter should be sent 60 days after confirmation. Discussion ensued on if it should be done only at application or also at review. Group had consensus that it should be sent after confirmation for both ASII and ASER.

- **Client Survey – Pat**

Survey's began in March. A few have started trickling in. Pat said she expects to have full information/results at next meeting. Surveys were sent to all supervisors to give to the QA specialists, so all should have been using the survey instrument.

- **“Power” Posters - Staci**

As a follow-up from the conference, Staci proposed sending a small poster to the conference participants to remind them to continue their efforts in error reduction. It would come with a thank you and encouragement letter. The purpose is to extend the energy from the conference. The idea is to get it out before the summer months, while the conference is still fresh in worker's minds. Staci/Mike solicited feedback from the group.

Group liked the poster, but would like different wording – such as “We are committed to Payment Accuracy” or “Accuracy Matters to Me and You”.

- **Client Advisory Posters - Lisa**

Lisa handed out samples of poster designs. Sara is going to check the language/wording. Lisa is taking the lead and will let us know when they will go out. Mike and Marcia will assist.

- **800/Info Line - Sara**

Sara asked this to be taken off agenda. This idea has been dropped.

- **Statewide Interviewing Investigative Skills**

This contract could not be just awarded to Tim Guard directly, so was sent out for bid. Proposals are due by May 3rd. Material was sent to four agencies (including Tim Guard) for the request for proposal.

X. Future Projects

- Alerts - see alerts discussion in VI.
- Calendar for workers will be discussed in June.
- Jenny brought up suggestion that came from the conference that maybe the counties with zero error rates team up with similar counties that have an error rate to create a cooperative sharing. Christina said that a lot of that happens at the regional supervisors meetings right now. She also thought that though a good idea, worried about workload issues and logistics to have agencies pull it off right now. Sara said maybe the quarterly newsletter could help communicate good practices. Mike said maybe even have the suggestion in the newsletter about agencies hooking up together for support. Mike said it could also go through the PAC committee because they are in a good position to see similarities and help with matching agencies up.

XI. May 20th Agenda Items

- Data Warehouse – Dave Hippler will be invited to come to discuss FS implementation of Data Warehouse reports. Would be first report.
- Error Rate Reports
- Survey results from Pat
- Supervisory Forum – add to May 20th agenda.
- Calendar for workers – add to May 20th agenda.
- PowerPoint review of draft “final” version
- Ongoing Project reports
- Alerts – Jackie will email out issue paper and members are expected to review the Alerts training guide on New Worker Central

Jackie Bennet will do minutes for the next meeting.

Handouts given out at meeting:

- Approved Local Agency Error Reduction Proposals
- WI 3rd Annual FS Conference 2002 Conference Evaluation Narrative
- Food Stamp Error Summary 10/20/01 – 12/20/01 chart
- Food Stamp Error Summary Report